DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 475 581 SO 034 789

AUTHOR	Avery, Patricia G.
TITLE	Using Research about Civic Learning to Improve Courses in the Methods of Teaching Social Studies.
PUB DATE	2003-00-00
NOTE	34p.; Paper presented at the Conference of the Education in Democracy for Social Studies Teachers: An Institute for Florida Teacher Educators (Gainesville, FL, April 11, 2003).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Citizenship Education; Democracy; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Global Approach; *Methods Courses; *Models; Perspective Taking; Preservice Teachers; *Public Schools; *Social Studies; Student Needs; Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

One of the primary ways in which young people acquire civic knowledge and skills is through social studies courses. The public school system traditionally has a purpose in the development of citizens However, the major responsibility for providing explicit civics instruction and experiences rests with the social studies curricula. How do social studies teachers today negotiate their way through changing national and global contexts, through civic identities that are torn between the national and global? The primary purpose of this paper is to suggest some of the understandings preservice teachers should develop, and the experiences they should have to nurture the civic identity of young people in a multicultural, globally interdependent society. The paper examines two models of good citizens, (1) traditional, and (2) future-oriented. It describes their conceptualizations of the good citizen, and identifies the characteristics suggested as essential. It examines the degree to which young people today reflect those characteristics. It is the gap between the characteristics of the ideal citizen (traditional and future-oriented) and the characteristics of the young people today, as suggested by the research, that best informs those interested in the preparation of social studies teachers. The paper finds that social studies methods classes provide preservice teachers with many opportunities to practice methods that facilitate perspective-taking and that educators need to consciously integrate global perspectives and issues into their methods courses. (Contains 5 notes, 2 tables, and 40 references.) (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 475 581

Using Research about Civic Learning to Improve Courses in the Methods of Teaching Social Studies

Patricia G. Avery, Professor

168 Peik Hall

159 Pillsbury Drive, SE

University of Minnesota

Minneapolis, MN 55455

avery001@umn.edu

SO 034 789

Paper to be presented at the Conference of the Education in Democracy for Social Studies Teachers: An Institute for Florida Teacher Educators, April 11, 2003, Gainesville, Florida.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Avery

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent

Social Studies Teacher Education in an Era of Globalization

As I sit writing this chapter in February 2003, I reflect on the events of the past few weeks. The "terrorist alert" in the United States was upgraded from blue to orange; U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell briefed the Security Council of the United Nations on Iraqi President Saddam Hussein's "weapons of mass destruction"; President George W. Bush pledged a substantial amount of support to Africa to combat AIDS; North Korea announced that it does have nuclear weapons, and that the United States does not have exclusive rights to "pre-emptive strikes"; millions of people around the world joined in a mass demonstration against the U.S. government's policy toward Iraq on February 15; and the Columbia space shuttle exploded upon entry into the earth's atmosphere, killing a team of astronauts which included two women, one native Indian, one African-American, and one Jewish male from Israel. Each of these events tells us something about the United States, as well as the world, today.

The deep interconnections among peoples, nations, and cultures are a source of fear and sustenance, of shared achievement and of shared tragedy. What does it mean to be a citizen in a world connected by the Internet, but not by democratic ideals? A citizen in a global economy, but not a global community? And a citizen in a world in which corporate power is increasingly more important than the power of the nation-state?

One of the primary ways in which young people acquire civic knowledge and skills is through social studies classes. Although the public school as an institution has as one of its primary purposes the development of citizens, traditionally, the major responsibility for providing explicit civics instruction and experiences rests with the

social studies. Social studies teachers have an awesome responsibility today. The nature of citizenship is in transition as issues change from primarily local or national to primarily global, and as politics' formal boundaries expand from the traditional notion of voting and serving on juries to working on global problems such as environmental and human rights issues. Are we now "citizens of the world," as philosopher Martha Nussbaum (1996) envisions? No, but we are also no longer the citizens whose concerns lie primarily within our national borders. How do social studies teachers today negotiate their way through changing national and global contexts, through civic identities that are torn between the national and global?

My primary purpose in this chapter is to suggest some of the understandings preservice teachers should develop, and the experiences they should have in order to nurture the civic identity of young people in a multicultural, globally interdependent society. I take a somewhat circuitous route. First, I look at two models of "good citizens," one more traditional and one more future-oriented. I describe their conceptualizations of the "good citizen," and identify the characteristics they suggest are essential. I then examine the degree to which young people today reflect those characteristics. It is the gap between the characteristics of the ideal citizen (both traditional and future-oriented) and the characteristics of the young people today, as suggested by the research, that best informs those interested in the preparation of social studies teachers.

The Traditional Model of Citizenship

The first model of democratic citizenship focuses on the citizen in the national context. Proposed by political scientists Norman Nie, Jane Junn and Kenneth Stehlik (1996), this model combines the attributes of classical republicanism and liberalism. Nie

et al. suggest that the democratic citizen is both engaged and enlightened. She is engaged in political activities, such as voting and campaigning, but she brings to those activities a sense of democratic enlightenment—an understanding and commitment to the principles of democracy. That is, the act of voting *per se* is not sufficient in a democracy; voting took place in Hitler's Germany and in South Africa during apartheid, but not for democratic purposes. Similarly, a citizen may appreciate democratic principles such as freedom and tolerance, but her beliefs are rendered meaningless unless they translate into action. Nie et al. identify the characteristics of the engaged, enlightened citizen as one who has knowledge of the principles of democracy, political leaders and other current political facts; participates in the political process by being attentive to politics, by voting, and by participating in those political activities that require greater effort, such as contacting public officials, and working on a campaign (see Table 1). Some of these characteristics are uniquely associated with democratic engagement (e.g., contacting public officials) or with democratic enlightenment (e.g., tolerance), and others are characteristics of both democratic engagement and enlightenment. For example, the engaged citizen is attentive to politics because he is watching out for his own self-interest; the enlightened citizen is attentive because she is concerned about threats to the democratic way of life.

Table 1

Nie et al.'s characteristics of political engagement and democratic enlightenment

Attribute	Engagement	Enlightenment
Knowledge of principles of democracy		X
Knowledge of leaders	X	
Knowledge of other current political facts	X	X
Political attentiveness	X	X
Participation in difficult political activities	X	
Voting	X	X
Tolerance		X

This is a traditional model of citizenship, and the characteristics associated with it are those with which most of us would agree. It is, at the same time, quite parochial in its view of citizenship. Indeed, Nie et al.'s book is entitled *Education and Democratic Citizenship in America*. It is silent on the citizen's relationship to those states and peoples outside of the United States, or on issues that transcend national boundaries.

A Model of Citizenship in the Global Context

In the new millennium, "domestic" and "foreign" affairs are so intertwined that increasingly, it does not make sense to talk about the two as if they could be (or ever have been) separated. The ongoing process of globalization, according to Yergin (2002), is:

> a move to a more connected world in which barriers and borders of many kinds—from the Iron Curtain to corporate identity to government

> control of airwaves—are coming down, driven both by technological change (especially technologies that bring down the costs of transportation and communication) and by ideas and policies that bring down the barriers to the movement of people, goods and information. This is an era in which a world that is organized around nation-states is increasingly conjoined in a global marketplace, where national economies are increasingly interwoven through the growing flows of trade, investment and capital across historical borders. (p. 111)

Education professor John J. Cogan, building on the work of others (see, for example, Hanvey, 1982) recognized the implications of globalization for the definition of the "good citizen." The Citizenship Education Policy Study (CEPS), directed by Cogan, used an Ethnographic Delphi Futures Research model to identify citizen characteristics needed in a more globalized society (Cogan & Derricott, 2000). The Delphi Approach uses an iterative questioning strategy to identify and develop consensus among participants.[1]

In the mid-1990s, researchers involved in the CEPS project identified a multinational panel of 182 scholars, practitioners, and policy leaders from education, science and technology; business and labor; and government. The panel reflected the nationality of the 26 researchers involved in the project: individuals from the regions of the Asia Pacific Rim (Japan and Thailand), Europe (Germany, Greece, Hungary, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom) and North America (the United States and Canada). The project sought to identify the panel's consensus on global trends over the next 25 years, the characteristics desired of citizens. For our purposes, we are most concerned with the desired characteristics of citizens in the 21st century.

Panelists from the three regions agreed that citizens of the new millennium must have the:

- Ability to understand, accept, appreciate and tolerate cultural differences;
- Capacity to think in a critical and systemic way;
- Willingness and ability to participate in politics at the local, national, and international levels;
- Ability to work with others in a cooperative way and to take responsibility for one's roles/duties within society;
- Willingness to resolve conflict in a nonviolent manner;
- Ability to look at and approach problems as a member of a global society;
- Willingness to change one's lifestyle and consumption habits to protect the environment; and
- Ability to be sensitive toward and to defend human rights (e.g., rights of women, ethnic minorities). (Kubow, Grossman, & Ninomiya, 2000, p. 132)

The first three characteristics are similar to those found in the Nie et al. model; the characteristics that differ from the traditional citizenship model are those that recognize the individual in relation to others, and as part of an interconnected, global society. While the traditional citizen must be attentive to politics, the citizen in the global context must be particularly attentive to issues that transcend national borders. And while the traditional citizen participates in difficult political activities, the citizen in the global context must learn to work with others in a cooperative manner.

When the two models of citizenship characteristics are merged and adapted somewhat, the resulting framework is one of an individual whose civic identity is grounded in the national context, but connected to the global society (see Table 2).

Table 2

Attributes of the Democratic Citizen in a Global Context
Knowledge
Principles of democracy
Structure and function of government
Leaders and political organizations
Skills
Technological Literacy
Critical and Systemic Thinking
Conflict resolution
Behaviors
Political Attentiveness
Voting
Participation in difficult political activities
Orientations/Values
Tolerance and cooperation
Concern for human rights and environmental issues
Global perspective

Others involved in civic education would surely choose somewhat different attributes of the engaged and enlightened democratic citizen, but most of these characteristics are found throughout the literature in one form or another. I understand, as well, that the categories are not as distinct as they appear here; for example, an individual must be politically attentive in order to have some knowledge of political leaders and organizations. Still, the framework provides an organizational scheme for thinking about the desired characteristics of citizens in the 21st century, and a format for evaluating the current status of citizenship education. In the next section, I ask, What do we know about the political knowledge, skills, participation, and orientations of young people today?

Political Knowledge

As a regular feature of his television show, late night talk show host Jay Leno stands on a street corner and asks pedestrians (usually teenagers and adults in their 20s) questions about current events in a segment known as "The Jay-Walkers." People are frequently unable to identify pictures of major political figures such as the President and Vice-President of the United States. The segment reflects the conventional wisdom that young people are civically apathetic and illiterate.

The research suggests a more nuanced picture. In the late 1990s, the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement's (IEA) Civic Education Study (*CivEd*), assessed the political knowledge and engagement of 14-year-olds in 28 countries (see Baldi, Perie, Skidmore, Greenberg, & Hahn, 2001; Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, & Schulz, 2001; Torney-Purta, Schwille, & Amadeo, 1999). As part of the study, students were asked 25 questions about their understanding of democracy. Following is a sample item, which requires students to recognize non-democratic practices.

> A woman who has a young child is interviewed for a job at a travel agency. Which of the following is an example of discrimination? She does not get a job because…
>
> A. She has no previous experience.
>
> B. She is a mother.
>
> C. She speaks only one language.
>
> D. She demands a high salary. (Baldi et al., 2001, p. 17)

On this item, 80% of the U.S. 14-year-olds gave the correct response (B), as compared to the international average of 50%. On the total content knowledge scale of 25 items, U.S. students were significantly above the international mean, and in no country did students score significantly higher than the U.S. students.

Niemi & Junn (1998), in their secondary analysis of data from the 1988 National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) civics assessment, also found U.S. high school seniors' understanding of discriminatory practices to be strong. Knowledge that is likely to be reinforced outside the classroom, such as knowledge of the criminal and civil justice systems and the general rights of citizens, are areas in which students demonstrated a fairly high level of familiarity. For example, almost all students have seen lawyers arguing in the courtroom, watched a judge give instructions to a jury, or heard suspects given their Miranda rights, whether on fictional television dramas such as *Law and Order* and *The District,* or actual courtroom procedures, such as that televised in the O.J. Simpson trial.

Other studies suggest that U.S. citizens tend to be particularly cognizant of their rights when compared to individuals from other countries. Among youth and adults, "being American" is most often associated with individual rights and freedoms (Conover, Crewe, & Searing, 1991; Sigel & Hoskin, 1981).

There are, of course, areas in which students' knowledge is considerably weaker. Political parties and comparative politics are two such topics. Niemi and Junn's (1998) analysis of the 1988 NAEP data on civics indicated that high school seniors' knowledge of political parties in the U.S. is weak. Forty-two percent of the students thought that there were only two political parties in the United States, and only 38% had a general

idea of how presidential candidates are nominated. Students' knowledge of comparative politics was found similarly lacking. Less than two-thirds of U.S. seniors could identify the main purpose of the United Nations (Niemi & Junn, 1998).

Interviews with young people provide a picture of the depth of students' understandings. Sigel and Hoskin (1981) found that twelfth grade students could easily espouse the "slogans of democracy," but when probed in interviews, were unlikely to demonstrate any depth of understanding of these concepts. Similarly, Sinatra, Beck and McKeown's (1992) interviews with young people in the fifth grade and then again when they were in the eighth grade suggested that their understanding of democracy did not increase, and that students were unable to articulate the relationships among democratic concepts.

There is an "achievement gap" in civics knowledge, similar to that demonstrated in math, science, and reading (Lutkus et al., 1999). Majority students (whites) and higher socio-economic status students score significantly higher in terms of political knowledge and skills than do minority and lower socio-economic states students. This is troubling, particularly given that the single best predictor of political sophistication and involvement is political knowledge (see Delli Carpini & Keeter, 1996). Thus, there is little to suggest that the voices often unheard in the political arena today will be present in the near future.

Political Skills

Citizens require more than political knowledge to engage in the formal political sphere; they also need the skills to find and interpret political information, to read graphs and tables, and to critically evaluate sources. Finding information, such as a state

representative's voting record, the amount of trade between the United States and Saudi Arabia, or the way in which Seoul's major newspapers are presenting South Korea's relationship to North Korea, increasingly requires students to have technological competence. Yet, studies suggest that use of computer technology in the social studies classroom is still at the most basic level. Only 12% of secondary social studies teachers in a 1998 national survey indicated frequent computer usage (defined as 20+ uses by typical student in class over year) (Becker, 2001, p. 5). In a case study of four social studies teachers, Johnson (2002) found that "even if the teacher is proficient with a particular computer application (e.g., Internet browser software), he/she did not always know how to use that software program to develop meaningful learning opportunities for students" (p. 206).

Although computer technology enables us to gather information from a v le range of sources, it does not help us interpret and evaluate the information. Th -nation *CivEd Study* assessed what students are able to do when they are given inform ation, i.e., how well students critically analyze and evaluate political information. On the following item from the *CivEd Study*, 83% of the U.S. students gave the correct answer (B), while the international mean was much lower, 65%.

We citizens have had enough!

A vote for the Silver Party means a vote for higher taxes. It means an end to economic growth and free enterprise. Vote for more money left in everyone's wallet! Let's not waste another 4 years! VOTE FOR THE GOLD PARTY

This is a political advertisement that has probably been issued by…

A. The Silver Party.

B. A party or group running against the Silver Party.

C. A group which tries to be sure elections are fair.

D. The Silver Party and the Gold Party together. (Torney-Purta et al., 2001, p. 48)

On the civic skills section of the *CivEd Study,* U.S. students scored higher than students from any other country.

One of the primary ways in which students develop critical and systemic thinking skills is by engaging in substantive discussions of public issues. It is difficult to imagine how one can develop critical and systemic thinking skills without engaging in public issues discussions. It is, after all, through exchanges with individuals who do not share our views that we are most likely to question, as well as to understand, our positions. Hearing from the "other" prompts us to think deeper about issues, to abandon, affirm, or modify our own viewpoints.

The ability to engage in discussions of public issues is a particularly important skill in a democratic society. Democracy is predicated on the notion that people can come together, and through an exchange of views, be able to make decisions about how they choose to live. Although there have been no systematic studies of students' ability to discuss public issues, research does provide some evidence of the frequency and quality of public issues discussions in classrooms.

Most research indicates that students are unlikely to engage in in-depth public issues discussions in which they grapple with conflicting ideas (Kahne, Rodriguez, Smith & Thiede, 2000; Newmann, 1990;Wilen & White, 1991). The research suggests that the recitation style of interaction (teacher asks, students responds, teacher asks, students respond, etc.) is still most prevalent in social studies classrooms. When students *are* discussing public issues, their views are rarely challenged, and few lines of thinking are explored in detail, a type of discussion Parker (2003) refers to as "blather."

A particularly disturbing finding is the difference in the amount of discussion between schools. In a study of four diverse communities across the United States (Conover & Searing, 2000), students from rural (68%) and suburban (50%) areas reported significantly more discussion of political issues in class than did students from urban (25%) and immigrant (34%) communities. Other studies (Anyon, 1980; Oakes, 1985; Page, 1991) have documented similar findings: students who are least privileged are also those who are least likely to engage in substantive discussions or be exposed to challenging content.

Conflict resolution and peer mediation programs have been implemented in elementary and secondary schools throughout the country since the early 1980s, but the

amount of research on their effectiveness is modest, in part because of the difficulty of isolating a program as the main cause of changes in behavior. Available research suggests, however, that students *can* be taught conflict resolution skills, and that when conflict is managed constructively, there are many positive outcomes, such as increasing the motivation and energy of students to solve problems, increasing their achievement and productivity, clarifying students' identity and values, and increasing students' understanding of other perspectives (Coleman & Deutsch, 2000; Johnson & Johnson, 1995).

Political Behaviors

Attention to political activities, whether through newspaper reading, television viewing, or radio, is associated with higher levels of political knowledge (Niemi & Chapman, 1998). Almost 80% of U.S. 14-year-olds in the *CivEd Study* reported "sometimes" or "often" watching news broadcasts on television. The main source of news for young people is television, followed by the newspaper and then the radio. Students reported that they were more likely to read about national events (62%) in newspapers as opposed to international issues (53%).

Who do young people talk with about political issues? The 14-year-olds surveyed in the *CivEd Study* reported discussing political issues with parents and teachers more than with their peers. Students said they were much more likely to discuss national issues as opposed to international issues. When students *do* discuss international issues, however, they are most likely to discuss them with their teachers (Baldi et al., 2001, p. 87).

Among the young people from the 28 countries involved in the *CivEd Study,* there was a moderate consensus that voting in every election was part of good citizenship. In the United States, 83% of the 14-year-olds reported that voting in every election is "very important" or "somewhat important" to good citizenship. Other studies of adolescents, as well as those with adults, highlight the importance of voting as one of the rights and responsibilities of citizenship (Conover, Crewe, & Searing, 1991; Conover & Searing, 2000).

Are young people willing to engage in efforts beyond voting? Interestingly, across countries, the young people surveyed in the *CivEd Study* were more likely to favor social-movement conceptions of citizenship in comparison to more conventional ideas about citizenship. For example, they were more likely to say that it is "very important" or "somewhat important' that an adult who is a good citizen take part in activities promoting human rights and protecting the environment than that the citizen follow political issues in the media or join a political party. In the United States, more than 80% of all students felt that involvement in community service, human rights issues, and activities to promote the environment were a part of good citizenship. Yet only 66% and 58% of the students saw following political issues in the media and engaging in political discussion as important to citizenship, respectively. The greater the effort participatory activities require, the less likely students are to say they think they will engage in them as adults. Only 28% of the fourteen-year-olds from the United States thought they would "probably" or "definitely" write a letter to the newspaper about social or political concerns, and fewer than one in five (18%) thought they would be a candidate for a local political office (Baldi et al., 2001).

In Conover and Searing's (2000) study of four demographically different communities in the U.S., 83% of the students reported that it was a "duty" to vote in elections. Yet less than half of the students thought it was a duty to protest bad laws (49%), to participate actively in politics (29%), or to participate in public discussions (28%). Students seem to have very "basic" or "minimalist" conception of the responsibilities of citizenship.

Democratic Orientations and Values in a Global Context

Three overlapping orientations are of particular interest here: a global perspective, concern for environmental and human rights issues, and a tolerance for diversity of beliefs. The latter two, however, are largely subsumed by the development of a global perspective.

Robert Hanvey, a pioneer in the development of the concept of "global perspective," identifies its five components:

(1) Perspective Consciousness,

(2) State of the Planet Awareness,

(3) Cross-Cultural Awareness,

(4) Knowledge of Global Dynamics, and

(5) Awareness of Human Choices. (Hanvey, 1982, p. 162)

Perspective Consciousness is the ability to recognize that one does, indeed, *have* a perspective—a perspective that is shaped by family, culture, tradition, etc. Beyond acknowledging one's own perspective, however, is the recognition that *others* also have a perspective that is shaped by their family, culture, tradition, etc. A perspective is much

more than a viewpoint or an opinion; it is the deeply rooted "glasses" through which one interprets the world.

Closely related to *Perspective-Consciousness* is *Cross-Cultural Awareness,* which includes an awareness of the diversity of beliefs and practices throughout the world, as well as the ability to view one's own culture through the "eyes" of another culture. *State of the Planet Awareness* entails knowledge of trends and issues that transcend borders: population growth, deforestation, air and water pollution, development, trade, disease, and so on. Taken together, *Cross-Cultural Awareness* and *State of the Planet Awareness* mean that an individual can analyze global issues from multiple perspectives, particularly from other cultural perspectives.

Knowledge of Global Dynamics is rooted in a systems perspective—the understanding that single "cause-effect' relationships are inadequate, and that an event has multiple causes and effects—some intended and some unintended. An increasing understanding of systems necessarily makes the *Awareness of Human Choices* more difficult. That is, when we have a greater appreciation for the multiple ways in which our decisions might affect the global system, the decision-making process becomes much more complex.

To what degree have young people developed a "global perspective?" In the *CivEd Study,* students across countries believed that a "good citizen" is involved in activities that support human rights and protect the environment. In the United States, more than 80% of the fourteen-year-olds surveyed believed that the "good citizen" should take part in activities to promote human rights and protect the environment (Baldi et al., 2001, p. 61). It seems that human rights issues tap young people's idealism and challenge

their belief in a "just world." Environmental issues also tend to be of particular interest to youth, perhaps because these issues can be concretized, that is, students can "see" the effects of water pollution, and can take actions to limit it; they can "see" litter and waste, and can work to recycle products. At the same time, when asked whether they had participated in a human rights or an environmental organization, only 6% and 24% of U.S. students said yes, respectively (Torney-Purta et al., 2001, p. 142).

Students' interest in other international issues tends to be low. U.S.-born students and adults consistently demonstrate a limited interest and knowledge of international events and issues. Not surprisingly, U.S. citizens' ability to see cross-cultural perspectives is often inadequate. When the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press released a survey in 2002 of people in 44 countries suggesting that negative attitudes toward the United States were increasing, the American public was surprised. Newspaper headlines and talk show hosts queried, "Why do they hate us?"

Tolerance for diversity of belief is a value implicit in Hanvey's definition of a "global perspective." Tolerance is the willingness to extend civil liberties to persons or groups with whom you disagree. It is particularly important in a democracy where people are expected to govern themselves.

Young people in the United States, as well as adults, are very supportive of freedom of expression in the abstract. Consistent with other studies, in the *CivEd Study*, 90% of the U. S. 14-year-olds said that it was "somewhat good" or "very good" for democracy when "everyone has the right to express their opinions freely." Only 78% of the students, however, believed that the right to protest unjust laws was good for democracy (Baldi et al., 2001, p. 54). In Hahn's (1998) study of young people in

Denmark, England, Germany, the Netherlands, and the United States, American and Danish students tended to be more tolerant than their counterparts. Still, only 35% of the students in Denmark and the United States were willing to allow their "least-liked group" to run for public office.

In their four-community study of young people, Conover and Searing (2000) found that 80% of the adolescents interviewed did not consider tolerance a duty of citizenship; 40% of the urban students saw *no connection* between tolerance and citizenship. These findings suggest that adolescents have but a modest understanding of freedom of expression and its role in a democracy.

Summary

These 12 characteristics are not the only attributes of democratic citizenship in an interdependent world, but they provide a basic framework for thinking about such a citizen. As we think about U.S. students' political knowledge, skills, participation and democratic orientations/values, what patterns or themes emerge?

A predominant theme is the fragility of U.S. students' political knowledge understandings, and commitments. Together with colleagues, I previously identified this as students' "lip-synching to the tune of democracy" (Thalhammer, Wood, Bird, Avery & Sullivan, 1994). Young people recognize important political concepts, such as democracy, freedom of expression, and political parties, but cannot explain their significance. They see voting as an important duty of citizens, but cannot explain how it is critical to the sustenance of a democracy. They are willing to participate in political processes, but only if their participation does not require a lot of effort.

A related theme is students' difficulty in making connections across political concepts. For example, students identify human rights and environmental issues as important concerns, but their minimal interest and knowledge of political organizations suggests that they may not be making a connection between "formal politics" and their concern for global issues.[2] Similarly, many students fail to see the connection between conflict and democracy, and to understand that conflict is a necessary part of democracy.

A third theme is the degree to which students' responses reflect the strong sense of individualism characteristic of American culture. Similar to adults, students are well aware of their individual civil and political rights. They are significantly less likely to acknowledge any *duties* of citizenship beyond voting. On the positive side, this sense of individualism may translate into a higher level of critical thinking among U.S. students as compared to their international counterparts. U.S. students are encouraged to express their opinions, even if they are not required to support those opinions with evidence.

Fourth, despite their concern for environmental and human rights issues, students are much more knowledgeable of, interested in, and attentive to national concerns as opposed to international issues and events. They are generally unfamiliar with international organizations or the structure of other countries' governments. This parochialism is likely to inhibit their ability to adopt a global perspective.

Finally, underlying much of the research on students' political knowledge, skills, participation and orientations/values, is a significant divide by student ethnicity and class. Political scientist Robert Putnam (1996) defines "social capital" as the "networks, norms, and trust that enable [citizens] to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives" (p. 34). School should be one of the primary places for the development of

young people's social capital. But the students who come to school most lacking in social capital, are precisely those least likely to develop and accumulate social capital at school. Students of color and lower socio-economic students are least likely to experience discussions about significant political issues; they are least likely to report an "open and supportive classroom climate," and they demonstrate significantly lower levels of political knowledge and skills than their counterparts.

Implications for Civics Teachers and Teacher Educators

What are the implications of these findings for teacher educators? *First, I suggest that social studies methods classes provide preservice teachers with many opportunities to practice methods that facilitate perspective-taking.* The ability to take different perspectives underlies many of the attributes of the democratic citizen in a global context: the ability to engage in discussion, critical thinking, and conflict resolution; a concern for human rights and environment issues, an appreciation for tolerance, and a global perspective. We do not automatically consider perspectives other than our own, particularly if another perspective seems threatening to our interests. But the more young people practice perspective-taking, the more likely they will seek other perspectives when issues arise outside of school. Preservice teachers should thus develop a repertoire of strategies for promoting perspective-taking. Dialog poems,[3] role plays, public issues forums,[4] and structured controversy[5] represent a few of the methods or strategies that explicitly encourage perspective-taking.

Class discussions about controversial social and political issues, of course, provide an important opportunity for promoting perspective-taking skills. The skilled teacher can bring in multiple perspectives with prompts such as "Some people are

opposed to this idea. Can you think of why they might oppose it?" or "Who is likely to be affected by this policy? How might they feel about it?" In a well-structured class discussion, students often come to appreciate the complexity of public issues. They are less likely to categorize issues as "good" or "bad," "pro" or "con." They understand that there are vast "gray areas" associated with most significant issues. Student engagement in discussions of controversial social and political issues, in classrooms where teachers purposefully create a supportive and open climate for discussion, has been linked to higher levels of student political knowledge, tolerance, efficacy, and interest (Conover & Searing, 2000; Hahn, 1998; Torney-Purta et al., 2001).

In addition to developing citizenship skills, perspective-taking is also a good learning tool. Psychologists Matt Lieberman and Ellen Langer (1995) conducted a study with tenth grade students in which the experimental group was told to read a chapter in a history textbook from the perspective of a historical figure. The control group was told simply to read the chapter. A week later, the experimental group outperformed the control group in terms of recall of information and insight into the time period (the latter was demonstrated through an essay, which was scored by outside raters).

Second, in order to better prepare our preservice teachers, we need to consciously integrate global perspectives and issues into our methods courses. U.S. citizens are significantly less likely to read about, express an interest in, discuss, and be knowledgeable about international as opposed to national issues. In an age that is distinguished by profound social, cultural, and political interconnectedness, U.S. citizens must develop a better understanding of the world outside their borders.

It would be ideal if all teacher candidates could have some international experience before they are certified. And, indeed, far more of the students in my current methods classes have traveled abroad than had 15 years ago (about 66% as compared to 15%). Although we cannot require international experiences of our students, we can expose them to international content, issues, and perspectives.

Teacher educators can easily choose international issues to demonstrate various pedagogical methods. For example, when showing preservice teachers how to use a data retrieval chart, instead of using it to make generalizations about U.S. presidents, use it as a strategy for comparing leaders in human rights, such as Gandhi, King, Mandela and Aung San Suu Kyi. When demonstrating a Paidea Seminar, use the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as text instead of a more familiar U.S. text. When teaching current events, require that students seek views of the issue or event from newspapers in other countries, an assignment that today is easily conducted on the Internet.

Methods coursework can also include service learning projects that expose students to global issues, such as work with Green Peace or Amnesty International. Students can reflect on their work in terms of its personal significance, and also in terms of how they would structure a similar activity at the secondary level.

Third, methods instructors should give preservice teachers assignments that help them understand how young people think about social and political concepts and issues. For example, the concept of voting is particularly interesting because of the gap between students' belief that voting is an important part of being a good citizen (83% of the 14-year-olds in the *CivEd Study*), and actual voting practices as adults (in the 2000 Presidential election, only 33% of 18- to 24-year-olds voted). Preservice teachers could

interview their students about the concept of voting: Why is it important to vote? What difference will it make? Suppose I know my candidate will not win, why should I vote? Children are told that "every vote counts" and that is why it is important to vote, but rarely do they explore the ways in which voting works as a mechanism of accountability in a democracy.

The gap between Americans' support for freedom of expression in the abstract and its application to concrete situations is another example of a concept to be explored. Why is freedom of expression important? Many citizens view freedom of expression as a personal, individual right, but do not see how it is fundamental to a democracy. By talking with young people about their understanding of such basic concepts, preservice teachers can learn the limits of students' understandings, and develop lessons based on that knowledge.

Fourth, preservice teachers should become familiar with basic methods and tools that help students see connections between and among concepts. Study after study has shown that students are familiar with the terms associated with democracy, but have difficulty putting them together in a coherent framework. Schema theory suggests that strategies such as concept mapping and graphic organizers can help students link existing knowledge with new knowledge. Additionally, research by Sinatra et al. (1992) suggests that teachers should make explicit connections between political concepts (e.g., freedom of expression) and institutions (e.g., courts, media).

Fifth, methods instructors should help preservice teachers analyze social studies textbooks and materials. Several studies suggest that curriculum specifically designed to promote a deeper understanding of political concepts can have an impact on students

(Avery, Bird, Johnstone, Sullivan, & Thalhammer, 1992; Goldenson, 1978). But what conceptions of citizenship do traditional textbooks convey? How is conflict described? What is the role of other nations and peoples? What types of political participation are emphasized? How far does the text move beyond the "structures and functions of government"? Social studies teachers, of course, can then conduct the same exercise with their secondary students.

Finally, and perhaps most important, *methods instructors should help beginning teachers understand that the development of civic identity is a dynamic process that takes place in a social and cultural context.* This is particularly apparent in the consistent differences in students' political knowledge and attitudes, as well as differences in students' school experiences. For example, lower socio-economic students consistently demonstrate lower levels of civic knowledge; these same students, however, report a less open and supportive classroom climate, and fewer opportunities to discuss social and political issues than do their counterparts (Baldi et al., 2001; Lutkus et al., 1999). Beginning teachers need to understand the role they can play in perpetuating this disparity, or increasing all students' social capital.

As teacher educators, we know that our student teachers will "listen" more to what we do than what we say. If we want the social studies teachers of the 21st century to be able to integrate technology into their instruction, as student teachers they must see us integrating (*not* demonstrating) technology into our courses. If we want future teachers to be more likely to conduct meaningful classroom discussions about controversial social and political issues than their predecessors, then our student teachers need to see us welcoming such discussions. And if we want teachers to be able to help their students

take different perspectives, then we must model that skill when talking about current events as well as when reflecting on student teaching issues.

In conclusion, although methods courses are an important part of beginning teachers' preparation, research on teachers' professional development emphasizes the ongoing nature of teachers developing their pedagogical knowledge and skills. Teacher educators can play a major role in helping teachers periodically reflect on the ways in which their pedagogy, classroom climate, and school culture impacts young citizens. There is a critical need for more research on the ways in which teacher education—both in terms of preservice and practicing teachers—can work with teachers to develop a more enlightened, engaged citizenry.

As I sit here adding some final thoughts to this chapter in the second week of March 2003, the world is in turmoil. Some think we are on the verge of a Third World War, others a nuclear holocaust, and still others believe that the United States will save the world from unknown evil. I don't know which scenario, if any, will most approximate reality, but I do know that all would be more secure if we, as teacher educators, had worked to cultivate an engaged, enlightened citizenry for a globally interdependent world.

References

Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. *Journal of Education, 162* (1), 67-92.

Avery, P.G., Bird, K., Johnstone, S., Sullivan, J.L., & Thalhammer, K. (1992). Exploring political tolerance with adolescents: Do all of the people have all of the rights all of the time? *Theory and Research in Social Education, 20*(4), 386-420.

Baldi, S., Perie, M., Skidmore, D., Greenberg, E., & Hahn, C. (2001). *What democracy means to ninth-graders: U.S. results from the international IEA Civic Education Study* (NCES 2001-096). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Becker, H.J. (2001, April). *How are teachers using computers in instruction?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle.

Cogan, J.J., & Derricott, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Citizenship for the+ 21st century.* (Rev. ed.). London: Kogan Page Limited.

Coleman, P.T., & Deutsche, M. (2000). Cooperation, conflict resolution, and school violence: A systems approach. *Choices Briefs, 5,* New York, NY: Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Conover, P.J., Crewe, I.M., & Searing, D.D. (1991). The nature of citizenship in the United States and Great Britain: Empirical comments on theoretical themes. *Journal of Politics 53,* (3), pp. 800-832.

Conover, P.J., & Searing, D.D. (2000). A political socialization perspective. In L. M. McDonnell, P.M. Timpane, & R. Benjamin (Eds) *Rediscovering the Democratic Purposes of Education* (pp. 91-124). Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press.

Delli Carpini, M.X., & Keeter, S. (1996). *What Americans know about politics and why it matters.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Doppelt, J., & Shearer, E. (2002). *America's no-shows: Nonvoters, Who they are, why they don't vote and what it could take to bring them to the polls.* Washington, DC: Medill News Service, The Medill School of Journalism.

Goldenson, D.R. (1978). An alternative view about the role of the secondary school in political socialization: A field-experimental study of the development of civil liberties attitudes. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 6,* 44-72.

Hahn, C. L. (1998). *Becoming political: Comparative perspectives on citizenship education.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Hanvey, R. (1982). An attainable global perspective. *Theory into Practice, 21* (3), 162-167.

Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, R. (1979). Conflict in the classroom: Controversy and learning. *Review of Educational Research, 49* (1), 51-70.

Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, R. (1989). *Cooperation and competition: Theory and research.* Edina, MN: Interaction.

Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, R. (1995). *Creative controversy: Intellectual conflict in the classroom* (3rd ed.). Edina, MN: Interaction.

Johnson, T. (2002). *Computers in the social studies: How and why computers are used as an instructional tool.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Kahne, J., Rodriguez, M., Smith, B., Thiede, K. (2000). Developing citizens for democracy? Assessing opportunities to learn in Chicago's social studies classrooms. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 28* (3), 311-338.

Kubow, P., Grossman, D., & Ninomiya, A. (2000). Multidimensional citizenship: Educational policy for the 21st century. In J.J. Cogan, & R. Derricott (Eds.), *Citizenship for the 21st century* (Rev. ed.) (pp. 131-150). London: Kogan Page Limited.

Kurth-Schai, R., Poolpatarachewin, C., & Pitiyanuwat, S. (2000). Using the Delphi cross-culturally: Towards the development of policy. In J.J. Cogan, & R. Derricott (Eds.), *Citizenship for the 21st century* (Rev. ed.) (pp. 93-108). London: Kogan Page Limited.

Lieberman, M., & Langer, E. (1995). Mindfulness and the process of learning. In P. Antonacci (Ed.) *Learning and Context.* Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Lutkus, A.D., Weiss, A.R., Campbell, J.R., Mazzeo, J., & Lazer, S. (1999). *The NAEP civics report card for the nation.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Newmann, F.M. (1990). Qualities of thoughtful social studies classes: An empirical profile. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 22*(3), 253-275.

Nie, N.H., Junn, J., & Stehlik, K. (1996). *Education and democratic citizenship in America.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Niemi, R., & Chapman, C. (1998). *The civic development of 9th through 12th grade students in the United States: 1996.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES Report No. 1999-131)

Niemi, R.G., & Junn, J. (1998). *Civic education: What makes students learn.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Nussbaum, M. (1996). *For love of country: Debating the limits of patriotism.* Boston: Beacon Books.

Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Page, R. (1991). *Lower-track classrooms: A curricular and cultural perspective.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Parker, W.C. (2003). *Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Peterson, B. (2002). Planting seeds of solidarity: Weaving world justice issues into the elementary classroom. In B. Bigelow & B. Peterson (Eds.), *Rethinking Globalization: Teaching for Justice in an Unjust World* (pp. 18-28). Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools.

Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. (2002, December). *What the world thinks in 2002: The Pew Global Attitudes Project.* Washington, DC: Pew Research Center for the People and the Press.

Putnam, R.D. (1996). The strange disappearance of civic America. *The American Prospect,* 24, 34-48.

Sigel, R., & Hoskin, M. (1981). *The political involvement of adolescents.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Sinatra, G., Beck, I., & McKeown, M. (1992). A longitudinal characterization of young students' knowledge of their country's government. *American Educational Research Journal,* 29, 633-61.

Thalhammer, K., Wood, S., Bird, K., Avery, P.G., & Sulllivan, J.L. (1994). Adolescents and political tolerance: Lip-synching to the tune of democracy. *The review of Education/Pedagogy/Cultural Studies, 16* (3-4), 325-347.

Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann , R., Oswald, H., & Schulz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen.* Amsterdam: IEA.

Torney-Purta, J., Schwille, J., & Amadeo, J. (1999). *Civic education across countries: Twenty-four national case studies from the IEA Civic Education Project.* Amsterdam: IEA.

Wilen, W., & White, J.J. (1991). Interaction and discourse in social studies classrooms. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 483-495). New York: Macmillan.

Yergin, D. (2002). Globalization: The inside story of our interconnected world. *Social Education, 66* (2), 111-116.

[1] For an in-depth description of the Delphi Approach used in this study, see Kurth-Schai, Poolpatarachewin, & Pitianuwat, 2000.

[2] Interestingly, a recent study found that almost one-third of the non-voters in the United States are people who are "Doers": they volunteer, participate in their communities, and are attentive to the news (Doppelt & Shearer, 2002).

[3] See Peterson (2002).

[4] The National Issues Forum publishes excellent materials for conducting public issues forums. Contact National Issues Forums, 100 Commons Road, Dayton, Ohio 45459-2777. Phone: 619-485-7424

[5] Structured controversy is a strategy that seems particularly well suited for the beginning teacher. Developed by Johnson and Johnson (1979, 1989, 1995), structured controversy provides a format that beginning teachers and their students often need when first engaging in controversial issues discussions. For example, suppose students were given the following question for value inquiry: Should the United States trade with countries that have poor human rights records? The teacher divides the class into heterogeneous groups of four. Two persons in each group are assigned the pro position, while the other two persons research the con position. Typically, the teacher suggests readings that will help students develop a given position, and encourage students to explore additional resources. Students outline their position and plan ways to advocate it to the opposing pair. Each pair presents arguments for their position, while the opposing pair listens, takes notes, and asks questions for clarification. The pairs then switch sides and present the opposing side's view. In the final phase, students abandon their "positions" and try to reach a group consensus on the issue based on the merits of the arguments presented.

Extensive research on the effects of structured controversy suggests that participants develop more positive attitudes toward conflict, demonstrate higher levels of moral reasoning and perspective-taking, and develop more positive attitudes toward working with individuals from different racial and ethnic groups (Johnson & Johnson, 1979, 1989, 1995).

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Using Research about Civic Learning to Improve Courses in the Methods of Teaching Social Studies	
Author(s): Patricia G. Avery	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: Patricia G Avery	Printed Name/Position/Title: Patricia G. Avery Professor
Organization/Address: Univ. of MN, 168 Peik Hall Mpls., MN 55455	Telephone: 612 625 5802 FAX: 612 624 8277
	E-Mail Address: avery001@umn.edu Date: April 11, 2003

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC/CHESS
2805 E. Tenth Street, #120
Bloomington, IN 47408

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)